DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 071 EA 013 599

AUTHOR Levin, Henry M.
TITLE The Identity Crisis of Educational Planning.
INSTITUTION Stanford Univ., Calif. Inst. for Research on Educational Finance and Governance.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO IFG-PR-79-B19
PUB DATE Sep 79
GRANT OB-NIE-G-78-0212
NOTE 27p.: Paper prepared for a conference on "Facing Change in Latin America," of CINTERPLAN (Caracas, Venezuela, September 23-28, 1979).
AVAILABLE FROM Publications, Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, School of Education/CERAS Bldg., Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305 ($1.00).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Democracy: Economic Change: Educational Change: *Educational Development: Educational Improvement: *Educational Planning: Educational Policy: *Educational Research: Political Influences: Political Issues: Research Utilization

ABSTRACT

Educational planning is presently confronted by an identity crisis. As long as it was believed that educational expansion was a principal ingredient for securing economic growth, democratic political processes, and greater equality of economics and social participation, the tenets and practice of educational planning were rarely questioned. However, in recent years the failure of education and educational expansion to produce economic growth, political democracy, and reduction of inequalities have raised serious questions about the role of educational planning. Four specific roles of educational planning include logistics, technocratics, politics, and research. When planners convert political decisions into actual accomplishment by ascertaining the specific resource needs and details of implementation, their endeavors are said to involve logistics. The activities of educational planners as technocrats are characterized as using technical skills and principles to accomplish educational goals without regard for values. Educational planning becomes an expression of politics when it contributes to a political agenda. Educational planning as research involves attempts to uncover knowledge about the basic relations between educational changes and their consequences. No longer encumbered by tradition, educational planners can now choose new roles to create order out of the present state of confusion. (Author/JEH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED201071

IFG

Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION STANFORD UNIVERSITY

64 013 599

Program Report No. 79-B19

THE IDENTITY CRISIS OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

Henry M. Levin*

September 1979

* The author is Director of the Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance and Professor of Education, Stanford University.

This paper was prepared for a conference on "Facing Change in Latin America," of CINTERPLAN, Caracas, Venezuela, September 23-28, 1979. It will be published in a conference volume. The research for this project was supported by funds from the National Institute of Education (Grant No. OB-NIE-G-78-0212). The analysis and conclusions do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of this organization.

THE INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON EDUCATIONAL FINANCE AND GOVERNANCE

The Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance is a Research and Development Center of the National Institute of Education funded under the provisions of Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The Institute is administered through the School of Education at Stanford University and is located in the Center for Educational Research at Stanford. The research activity of the Institute is divided into the following program areas: finance and economics; politics; law; organizations; and history. In addition, there are a number of other projects and programs in the finance and governance area that are sponsored by private foundations and government agencies outside of the special R&D Center relation with NIE.

THE IDENTITY CRISIS OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

Abstract

Educational planning is presently confronted by an identity crisis. As long as it was believed that educational expansion was a principal ingredient for securing economic growth, democratic political processes, and greater equality of economics and social participation, the tenets and practice of educational planning were rarely questioned. However, in recent years the failure of education and educational expansion to produce economic growth, political democracy, and reduction of inequalities have raised serious questions about the role of educational planning. In this paper, four specific roles of educational planning are reviewed: (1) educational planning as logistics; (2) educational planning as technocratics; (3) educational planning as politics; and (4) educational planning as research. The dimensions and appropriateness of the four roles are explored, and an appeal is made for constructing new identities for educational planning on the basis of this analysis.

THE IDENTITY CRISIS OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

I. INTRODUCTION

Educational planning has entered a period of identity crisis. Gone are the days when educational planners knew precisely the directions to pursue. Today, the nature of the planning activity, its social role, and even its underlying motives have been called into question. Of course, it is not educational planning alone that is facing this identity crisis. but more properly, education itself. As long as popular ideology assumed that expansion of the educational system and educational opportunities were integral means to achieving a better society, educational planning benefitted from its association with the educational enterprise. In those golden days, the educational planner could view himself or herself as contributing to such noble objectives as promoting economic growth and development, proliferating democratic ideals and institutions, and contributing to social, economic, and political equality. After all, education was the widely-acknowledged panacea for poverty, economic stagnation, totalitarianism, and inequality. Particularly in developing societies, the great hopes for achieving prosperity, freedom, and equality were vested largely in the educational system.

We need only look back to the decades of the fifties and sixties to see the dominant role given education in fulfilling the aspirations for economic growth and development. Although partisans debated vigorously the relative virtues of the various technical approaches to educational planning -- for example, social demands vs. manpower planning vs. rate of return analyses -- there was clearly a tacit agreement among all of the protagonists that the expansion of the educational system and trained man-

power were crucial ingredients to a growth strategy. Indeed, this faith was so secure, that it was simply assumed that shortages of trained manpower were typically the major obstacles to economic growth and modernism.[1]

It is a cruel turn of history to find that by the seventies, the rapid expansion of the educational systems of developing societies seemed to have a much greater impact on increasing the number of educated-unemployed and underemployed than in accelerating rates of economic growth. Further, extension of schooling to rural areas tended to stimulate migration to cities that were already overly-burdened with high levels of unemployment and inadequate social services and infrastructure to absorb the new residents. In fact, there is considerably more evidence of the effects of education on accelerating rural to urban migration than on improving the standards of living in rural areas.[2] Clearly, we have learned that the relation between education and economic growth and development is far more complex than the premises assumed by educational planners, whether of the human capital or manpower planning persuasion. And along with economists and educators, educational planners have suffered a loss of prestige for overselling education as an economic palliative.

Although educational planners were most specific about the role of the planning activity in increasing economic growth, they were also able to ride the crest of the wave of popular belief in the expansion of education as a necessary foundation for creating democratic forms of government. It was asserted that by providing exposure to common values, institutions, and language, the necessary conditions for establishing and maintaining an effectively functioning democracy would be present. Conversely, an illiterate population was considered easy prey for a manipulative dictator-

ship. Further, by expanding the knowledge of citizens on the complex issues facing the modern nation, voters would have the wisdom to make the right choices and to possess the skills for evaluating critically the actions of their representatives in parlimentary democracies. It was taken as dogma that democracy and illiteracy are incompatible and that high levels of education and totalitarian forms of government are unlikely. After all, what educated citizen would tolerate a system of totalitarian control?

Today, it is possible to look back at these quaint notions with cynicism, particularly in Latin America. Despite much higher educational attainments today than fifteen or twenty years ago, there is clearly less democracy and less of an optimistic outlook for emerging democracy. Indeed, countries with relatively long traditions of parliamentary democracy such as Uruguay and Chile suffer from particularly harsh forms of totalitarianism, and other nations with shorter histories of democracy have seen their freedoms severed by military dictatorships. Clearly, the relation between education and development of democratic institutions is considerably more complex than we thought it was in the fifties and sixties. And, it has become rather difficult to argue that increased education of the populace, in itself, leads to a higher probability of democratic forms of government.

The third premise of the holy trinity of educational planning was that educational expansion would lead to greater economic and social equality. The evidence supporting such a view was considered to be substantial. The capitalist nations with the most equal distributions of

income such as those of Scandanavia and Western Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the U.S. also had far more educated populations than did countries that were less-developed. This suggested the additional evidence that education contributes to both economic growth and a more equal distribution of income.

Further support for the view that educational expansion will reduce inequalities was derived from the dualistic nature of developing societies. Such societies were considered to have two sectors, a traditional and modern one. The traditional sector uses very little capital with a heavy emphasis on subsistence farming, small workshops, and small commercial enterprises. This sector is relatively unproductive and unprogressive and requires little educated labor. In contrast, the modern sector entails the use of more advanced technology and capital and is far more productive. However, in order to qualify for jobs in the modern sector, it is necessary to have at least minimal levels of education.

The expansion of education would enable new groups of workers to qualify for modern sector jobs (where presumably there were shortages of trained manpower). And, as the educational system encompassed more and more of the population, a higher and higher proportion of the population would make the transition from low productivity and low income jobs to higher productivity and higher income employment.

Not only were such educationally-induced shifts from traditional employment to modern employment expected to reduce inequalities in the distribution of income, but the equalizing effect would be accentuated by the shifts in labor supply. By reducing the number of persons in the high unemployment-traditional sector, earnings would tend to rise; by increasing

the number of persons in the labor-short, modern sector, earnings would tend to fall. The overall effect would be that the earning differentials between the two sectors would decline somewhat.

Finally, the equalizing potential of education was reinforced by the human capital view which perceived of education as an investment in human skills and productivity. Given a more equal distribution of the investment among the population, one would expect a more equal distribution of income from that investment. Accordingly, the expansion of education was expected to more nearly equalize educational opportunities and enrollments, and these were expected to lead ultimately to greater economic and social equality.

Unfortunately, there is little historical support for the proposition that educational expansion and greater equality of educational attainments leads to greater equality of income. In countries like Brasil, and Mexico, statistical analyses show greater inequalities in the distribution of income, despite rapid growth of schooling and high levels of economic growth.[3] Comparisons of the distributions of education and of incomes for the 1950-1970 period suggest relatively small changes in the income distribution for most societies, but a substantial tendency towards equalization of educational attainments.

The burden of proof is now on those who advocate educational expansion and its attendent educational planning requirements as principal strategies for obtaining economic growth, democracy, and equality. It is not that education is irrelevant to these goals. Rather, it seems that education is only one of many ingredients within a rather complex set of historical dynamics that determines the status of the triumverate. Clearly, if educa-

tional expansion and its attendant educational planning activities do not assure the attainment of these goals, then educational planners are faced with the challenge of justifying their profession. In the remainder of this paper I will suggest several potential roles that educational planners might consider in addressing this quest. There will be no simple answers. There may be some parallels between what follows and the theater of the absurd, particularly the work of Pirandello in his "Six Characters in Search of an Author." Educational planners are now in need of an author who can create a new script, one that feels comfortable and that has meaningful roles for the actors.

II. THE FACES OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

In order to address potential roles of the educational planner, it is necessary to talk about the various faces of educational planning. In the past it could be assumed that the planner was charged with assisting in the development of the educational system to meet the aspirations of the body politic. As we mentioned in the introduction, these aspirations were generally given as economic growth, democracy, and equality. With these lofty purposes, it was not necessary to dissect the educational planning activity according to its particular orientations or facets. When persons wrote about educational planning, they could use very different assumptions and orientations as long as the overall goals overlapped with those of other educational planners. What gave educational planning a common foundation was its tacit objectives in improving society through educational expansion and rationalization, not a common set of operational premises and processes for reaching these goals.

Since one can no longer be assured that educational development, expansion, and rationalization provide the promised fruit of growth, democracy, and equality, one must begin to explore the nature of the educational planning activity itself. In doing this it is clear that there are almost as many approaches to educational planning as there are educational planners. However, I will suggest four basic activities of educational planning that are typically at the center of gravity of the planning endeavor. Eventually we will raise the questions of which ones are legitimate in which settings. This discussion may set the stage for alleviating the identity crisis of educational planning, now that the more romantic underpinnings of the profession have been disavowed.

Educational Planning as Logistics

No matter how educational decisions are established, they will normally have logistical consequences. Given the edict to expand the educational system at particular levels and in particular ways, school sites have to be selected; construction specifications must be established; instructional materials and equipment must be purchased; teacher requirements must be assessed; costs must be estimated; and budgetary requests for supporting the plans must be drafted. That is, after the basic decisions are made, the details must be drafted in order to implement them. I refer to this as the logistical face of educational planning. In my experience, the vast majority of persons who view themselves as educational planners perform these roles. There may be persons who are trained as architects, curriculum specialists, teacher training experts, finance specialists, administrators, and so on. Of course, they have often been trained as teachers and have left the classroom to work in the educational planning bureaucracy.

What is important in recognizing the logistical side of educational planning is that political decisions must be translated into actions. Often the political decisions are ambiguous, referring only to such general matters as the establishment of new schools, accomodation of additional enrollments at particular levels, the expansion of training of teachers by a specified amount, or the formation of a new institution or field of study. Educational planners must convert these decisions into actual accomplishments by ascertaining the specific resource needs and details of implementation and working closely with those who are empowered to set the plans in motion. In the main, the logistical definition of educational planning is a role that is largely devoid of sophisticated technology, political substance, and research. The logistics represent the nuts and bolts for getting the job done. There is little of an intellectual or romantic content to these tasks. But they have the distinguishing trait of being absolutely necessary.

Educational Planning as Technocracy

Logistical approaches to educational planning require skill and expertise, but to a large degree the skills required are practical and applied ones rather than abstract ones. Various rules of thumb are utilized to ascertain the numbers of classrooms, teachers, construction requirements, and so on that are necessary to transform a political decision into a fait accompli. However, there is a rather different level of function and expertise which might better be labeled educational planning as technocracy. The activities of educational planners as technocrats tend to be based on far more abstract exercises than those of the logisticians. The techocratic approach to educational planning is typically devoid of political and

social content or analysis of values. Rather it proceeds on the basis of a set of tools in search of a problem. Usually, the principal set of problems that the tools are appropriate to is that of planning enrollment levels in the different areas of education.

Of course, these tools are known more commonly by such names as social demands approaches, rate of return analysis, manpower planning, mathematical programming, and so on.[4] Each of these tools requires a set of technical skills and heroic assumptions about the relation between the magnitudes and distributions of educational enrollments and appropriate social policy. The relations are rarely made explicit, but only assumed. Some take account of priorities and costs, while others do not. Each has the appearance of "science" and precision, even though none have shown themselves to be consistently--or even inconsistently--capable of predicting such objectives as educational needs, enrollments, manpower needs, and so on.

Particularly important are the technocratic approaches to planning education for economic growth. Although both rate of return and manpower planning advocates provide incisive criticisms of the other, they share in common a rather mechanical way of looking at the purposes of education. Each represents a frozen technique rather than a sensitive approach to considering educational needs and the relation between education and the economy. The connection between education and the economy is assumed by the well-known "fixed coefficients" in the case of manpower planning and by the tacit acceptance of marginal productivity theory and perfect competion in the case of rate of return. That a casual glance at the world of education and work would shatter both sets of assumptions is ignored. Rather, it is technique that dominates the activity. And, perhaps even of greater concern is the fact that often the persons using the techniques have no deeper understanding beyond the ability to follow the requirements of the recipe.

There is a great danger in such technocratics that is best reflected in the saying: "When your thing is swinging a hammer, everything begins to look like a nail."

The technocratic approach to educational planning is to avoid matters as complex as values, political issues, and the validity of assumptions. Rather, it is to show virtuosity at wielding some very sophisticated hammers to address relations that are far too sensitive and complex to be resolved by such tools. Of course, the solutions to the imagined problems are solutions on paper alone, and it can be argued that few listen to them. Rather, it is educational planning for educational planners that is being executed. Whether the words and numbers are ever translated into something beyond these symbols is problematic. With respect to the logistical educational planners, they can claim that at the very least their efforts contribute to the establishment of schools, the construction of buildings, the training of teachers, and the instruction of students. Technocratic educational planners can hardly claim this much, although their contribution to the exhaustion of secretaries and library capacity as well as to the value of the stock of the Xerox and IBM Corporations should not be understated.[5]

Educational Planning as Politics

Educational Planning as politics refers to the use of the planning exercise to contribute to a particular political agenda, typically that of the existing government and political system. Such an act need not be conscious or purposive as much as it need be supportive of a particular political framework. In its most applied form, it may take the form of providing for the expansion or upgrading of schools in the areas of the country and among populations of the country that are most restive.

This would represent a calculated and conscious form of political activity under the guise of educational planning. But usually the role of educational planner as political advocate is far more subtle than this. Indeed, often the educational planner will not be aware of fulfilling a political role.

Especially important is the momentum of educational planning activities toward support of the status quo, even when the planner is committed personally to an alternative vision of society. In at least four ways, the educational planner tends to be an important part of such a political apparatus in nations like those of Latin America. First, the educational planner tends to legitimate the view that a better society can only be achieved through the painfully slow process of educational expansion and improvement. The problems of exploitation, inequality, and political tyranny are not addressed by the educational planners. Rather the planners support the rhetoric of the state that these are essentially educational problems. When the population reaches a higher level of literacy and understanding and the poor receive education for modern technologies, it is suggested that these problems will disappear.

The educational planner assists in perpetuating these myths and delaying the confrontation of the masses with the true sources of their domination. In part, this is because most educational planners tend to be logisticians and technocrats who do not raise questions about the sources of these dilemmas and prefer to assume that educational planning will indeed solve these problems.[6] In part, there is a genuine belief that despite all of the evidence to the contrary, education represents the only hope for overcoming the tyranny and exploitation. Whatever the reasons,

the educational planning activity serves to mystify the true causes of the social, political, and economic infirmities and tends to reinforce the reactionary political strategy of delaying change until the population can be educated to merit greater freedom and equality. In this respect, educational planning contributes to reproducing existing patterns of domination.

A second way in which educational planners perform a political role is in the support that they provide for multinational capitalist penetration. The expansion of schooling in its existing forms does little to address indigenous development needs, except to the degree to which they overlap with the needs of foreign investors. Multinational capitalists will invest in a country if the rate of profit is exceedingly high and the investment climate is stable. These conditions are met when there are large reserve armies of labor with the minimal requirements of literacy and familiarity with bureaucracy;[7] when free trade unions are proscribed by law and challenges to such laws are dealt with harshly; when concerns about health and safety in the workplace are ignored; and when minimum wages and social security are only selectively enforced and fall far behind inflation.

The situation that I have described encompasses most of Latin America. The role of the educational planner in this melange is to promote an expansion of schooling which contributes to the reserve army of unemployed and underemployed, particularly in urban areas where rural migrants comptete with urban residents for an inadequate number of jobs in the modern sector. Now if we bear in mind that the multinational investor has a substantial number of alternative investment sites, it is only when profits are substantial and greater than those of alternatives that he will maintain or expand investment in a particular country. If such investment had the effect of

reducing substantially the number of unemployed and underemployed persons with at least minimal literacy and bureaucratic training (generally the equivalent of six years of primary school), labor markets will tighten and labor costs will tend to rise, reducing the substantial profit margins. Thus, a major role of rapid educational expansion is to maintain a large labor surplus which will keep profits high enough to attract and retain investments. Paradoxically, the educational planner is charged with maintaining the conditions for exploitation of the national population by multinational firms.

Further, this model is structurally antagonistic to greater equality by its very logic. In order to keep multinational investments the profit rates must be high, so wages must be kept low by surplus labor. Under these conditions, a small domestic elite that provides both political access to the multinationals as well as other services and an upper-echelon of managers and professionals who work for the multinationals obtain income and wealth that enable them to live palatial existences. However, the masses must necessarily live at the margins of survival to support such a pattern of development. The educational planner attempts to make certain that enrollments expand at a rapid rate, often with a lack of awareness on whose interests are being served by these policies. Rarely, are such planners even aware that there might exist alternative patterns of educational development that will serve the needs of rural regions in ways that minimize dependence on foreign capital and bring about greater equality.

It is of more than passing interest to note that educational planning techniques did not arise in developing societies, but in the advanced capitalist societies of Western Europe and the U.S.[8] Is it not peculiar that

in a country like the U.S. which has never practiced educational planning, many of the basic planning methods have been developed and they have been proliferated about Latin America? Thus, one must raise the question, in whose behalf have these techniques been developed, and which agencies pay for their proliferation? Where have their advocates and practitioners been educated? These are simple questions, but their answers have profound implications for the political role reflected in the practice of educational planning.

A third way in which educational planning tends to be a political act is in its tendency to support an appearance of managed social change and to promote a high degree of centralization in educational matters. Planning is essentially an activity that is heavily predicated on centralization rather than democratic participation, despite all of the elegant language on democratic processes. Democracy tends to be a messy process in which different groups might have different aims and different processes for reaching them. These conflicts must be resolved before activities can be planned and implemented, and the educational planner solves these dilemmas by submerging them in the authority of his expertise.

Further, democracy suggests the possibility of decentralization and even marked differences in educational activities, as the needs of different groups in different regions may vary. But, these tendencies are overcome by presenting educational planning as an activity of expertise designed to address a national destiny and direction. If the technocratic aspects of educational planning do not resolve directly the problem that they address, they do make it clear that such planning is beyond the capability of all but a small cadre of trained technicians. Further, the psuedo-scientific language and symbolism

of the technocratic approaches to planning and the lofty language of objectives indicate to the average citizen that social change can only be managed by experts working at highly centralized levels and that most citizen are incapable of participating in that process and their perceived needs are too shortsighted. The very tenets of educational planning, then, tend to restrict decentralization and democratic participation, a very nice coincidence for the many authoritarian military and quasi-military political regimes of Latin America.

Finally, the educational planners perform a political role by providing a rationale for any failure of the nation to meet expectations. The most obvious example is found in the recent trend towards "qualitative" educational planning.[9] That traditional educational planning has not made nations more equal, productive, or democratic is becoming increasingly recognized. even by educational planners. The explanation is that educational planning concentrated too much on quantitative planning, while ignoring qualitative educational planning. While focussing on the numbers of teachers and schools that were provided at each level, the plans tended to ignore the quality of the teachers and facilities and the effectiveness of the curriculum. Thus, the new catchword in educational planning in qualitative. While the qualitative issue may be one which should be addressed on its own merits, it is unlikely to make any difference with respect to the "failures" of educational planning with respect to social, political, and economic goals for the obvious reason that these are not problems that are essentially educational.

In both manifest and latent ways and in both conscious and unconscious modes the educational planner tends to support the status quo and existing political structures. This tends to be true even when the educational planner

harbors personal views that are in marked contrast to those reflected in the present political frameworks. It is also obvious that the narrow logistical and technocratic roles discussed above can be perfectly consistent with and supportive of the political role. Most important, the political function of educational planning in areas like Latin America tends to run counter to the search for democracy and equality, and it is not even clear that it contributes to long run economic growth.

Educational Planning as Research

Given the failure of traditional educational planning approaches to provide the predicted results, it would appear that research should be a very high priority role for the educational planner. That is, without basic knowledge of the relations between education and the social, economic, and political systems, it is difficult to provide educational plans which will achieve objectives in those domains. Yet, the role of educational research has been one of the most neglected dimensions of educational planning.

Before proceeding, however, it is important to delineate what is meant by research. In the present context this term refers to attempts to uncover knowledge about the basic relations between educational changes and their social, political, and economic consequences as well as the conditions under which specific educational changes take place. I do not consider the application of standard mechanical procedures of educational planning to be research. Thus, I do not include mathematical programming algorithms, manpower planning calculations, or rate of return procedures in the research category, unless they are applied in a way that enables one to learn something fundamental about the nexus between education and society. In most applications, these techniques are just applied mechanistically to data

sets to derive numerical solutions to problems that are contrived artificially in order to be amenable to these techniques. The latter approaches fit more closely the technocratic role than the research one.

There are two reasons that educational planning encompasses so little educational research. First, typical, training regimen in educational planning provide little or no preparation in research methodology and analysis. Although logistical educational planners will assume that technocratic educational planners are well-trained in research methods, that is rarely the case. It is an assumption that is typically based upon a view of "the emperor's new clothes." Basic approaches to inquiry are rarely taught in the training programs for educational planning, except at the most applied levels. A second reason for the lack of research content is that in many developing societies open inquiry is not possible. Virtually all educational planners and researchers receive support for their positions from the State. An open approach to research would require that the problems be posed and addressed according to criteria which may not support the premises or actions of existing political powers.

For example, study after study has found that poverty and inequality are much more closely related to the nature of the economic and political system than to the level of "development" of its educational system.[10] In fact, a policy of economic growth based upon attracting foreign investment is perfectly consistent with both growing <u>inequality</u> in the distribution of income and increasing <u>equality</u> in the distribution of schooling. It is unlikely that government agencies supporting researchers or government - sponsored research in universities and research institutes would be able to report research results that undermine existing government policies.

Nevertheless, the fact that so much educational planning is based upon premises that are questionable suggests that educational research should play a greater role in the educational planning endeavor rather than a lesser role. It is a face of educational planning that needs far greater attention.

III. AT THE CROSSROADS

In the previous sections, I suggested that educational planners are facing an identity crisis. As long as it was assumed that educational planning contributed to a better society, basic questions about the role of educational planners were not raised. But, the failure of educational expansion and greater equality of educational opportunities and attainments to provide societies that are prosperous, democratic, and more nearly equal has raised serious questions about the functions of both education and educational planning. For these reasons, the planner is at a crossroad in which he/she faces an identity crisis.

Is the educational planner a supporter of reactionary forces or social, economic, and political change? Is the educational planner a thoughtful professional who considers carefully the consequences of his activities, or is he a mere logistician or technocrat who mimics the highly mechanistic recipes that fill the planning portfolio? To what degree does the whole ideology of educational planning as practiced in developing societies mirror the needs of multinational capital accumulation rather than the needs of national development? Is educational planning, by its nature, an anti-democratic activity that discourages participation by citizens and that mystifies the social, economic, and political relations of their lives? Is there a role for expanding free inquiry and improving the quality of research within the educational planning domain?

The problem in answering these questions is the strong possibility that educational planning plays a dual role. On the one hand, educational planners andthe focus of their endeavors--the educational system--are charged with ameliorating the poverty and oppression that afflict their societies. On the other hand, they serve to plan and legitimate educational approaches that tend to reproduce the conditions of both the existing forms of power and economic relations and to perpetuate the myth that evil social, economic, and political conditions are essentially attributible to educational deficiencies. For the vast majority of the population, educational opportunities represent the great hope for individual social mobility. Yet, the very nature of that educational system is one where few will reach the top, and most will simply fall by the wayside to become part of the urban unemployed or underemployed or an exploitable resource to engorge the profits of domestic and foreign corporations. To say the least, the educational planner finds himself between a rock and a hard place.

One of the good things about an identity crisis is that one can choose a new identity. That is, one is no longer encumbered by the baggage of tradition. Rather, one can step back from his or her previous identity and choose a new role or roles. The purpose of this essay was to provoke a search for new directions that might begin to create order from our confusion and an integrated activity out of our dualism or professional schizophrenia.[11] Clearly the choice will depend upon a complex set of political and ethical factors as well as scientific ones, and we may find that conflicts between the limits of educational planning and our aspirations are insurmountable when the societies in which we work are unjust. That is, we may be relegated to logistical experts, even if we desire more, and we

may contribute to the reproduction of the existing order, even though we dream of social change. But, the process of searching for our identities should proceed, if only to attain a peace of mind.[12]

FOOTNOTES

1. An example of a major work supporting this view is F. Harbison and C. A. Myers 1964.

2. The effects of education on migration represent one of the most consistent findings in determinants of mobility. See for example M. Levy and W. Wadycki 1974.

3. See M. Carnoy et al., 1976 and M. Carnoy 1978.

4. An excellent introductory discussion of many of these is found in M. Blaug 1970, especially Chapters 4-6.

5. A more optimistic view of technocratic approaches is found in Psacharopoulos 1978.

6. A major exception is the excellent set of articles in "Development and Education in Latin America" in Prospects 1978.

7. Often this is referred to as modernism in which the definition means "to classify as modern those personal qualities which are likely to be inculcated by participation in large-scale modern productive enterprises such as the factory, and perhaps more critical, which may be required of the workers and the staff if the factory is to operate efficiently and effectively." (Inkeles and Smith 1974, p. 19). And empirically, it was found that education "...was by far the single most important dimension of modernity." (Ibid., p. 284).

8. For example, manpower planning was developed in its most explicit form by H. Parnes 1962 and the origins of the human capital and rate of return approaches are summarized in G. Becker 1964 and T. Schultz 1961. One can find earlier referrals to these approaches by these authors and others, but the U.S. influence has clearly been enormous for a country that does not practice educational planning.

9. H. Levin 1978.

10. For an eloquent statement on this point, see G. Rama 1978.

11. For an overlapping but somewhat different treatment, see H. Weiler 1978.

12. The analysis of educational planning in a dialectical world is developed in H. M. Levin (forthcoming 1979).

REFERENCES

Becker, G. S. Human Capital. (New York:Columbia University Press, 1964).

Blaug, M. An Introduction to the Economic of Education (London:Penguin, 1970).

Carnoy, M. "Can Educational Policy Equalize Income Distribution?" Prospects, Vol. VIII, No. 1 (1978), pp. 3-18.

Carnoy, M. et al. Can Educational Policy Equalize Income Distribution in Latin America? (Geneva:International Labour Organisation, 1976).

"Development and Education in Latin America," Prospects, Vol. VIII, No. 3 (1978), pp. 295-361.

Harbison, F. and C. A. Myers. Education, Manpower, and Economic Growth. (New York:McGraw Hill, 1964).

Inkeles, A. and D. H. Smith. Becoming Modern. (Cambridge, Mass:Harvard University Press, 1974).

Levin, H. M. "Qualitative Planning: A Broad View, in Educational Planning: Towards a Qualitative Perspective, R. S. Adams (ed), (Paris:International Institute for Educational Planning, 1978), Chap. IV.

Levin, H. M. Workplace Democracy and Educational Planning (Paris:International Institute for Educational Planning (UNESCO), forthcoming, 1979).

Levy, M. B. and W. J. Wadycki. "Education and the Decision to Migrate: An Econometric Analysis of Migration in Venezuela," Econometrica, Vol. 42 (March 1974), pp. 377-388.

Parnes, H. S. Forecasting Educational Needs for Economic and Social Development (Paris: OECD, 1962).

Psacharopoulos, G. "Educational Planning: Past and Present," Prospects, Vol. VIII, No. 2 (1978), pp. 135-142.

Rama, G. W. "Education, Social Structure, and Styles of Development," Prospects, Vol. III, No. 3 (1978), pp. 306-319.

Schultz, T. W. "Education and Economic Growth," in Social Factors Influencing American Education, N. B. Henry (ed.), (Chicago:National Society for the Study of Education, 1961), pp. 46-88.

Weiler, H. N. "Towards a Political Economy of Educational Planning," Prospects, Vol. III, No. 3 (1978), pp. 247-367.